

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Nathaniel Flack	Team: Squad #3	CCRB Case #: 201700394	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Friday, 01/13/2017 6:13 PM	Location of Incident: Inside the 6th Precinct stationhouse	Precinct: 06	18 Mo. SOL 7/13/2018	EO SOL 7/13/2018	
Date/Time CV Reported Sat, 01/14/2017 3:30 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Sat, 01/14/2017 3:30 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POF Vanessa McBride	09625	929251	006 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SGT John Kaloudis	01514	928571	006 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POF Vanessa McBride	Discourtesy: Police Officer Vanessa McBride spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Case Summary

§ 87(2)(b) filed this complaint via the CCRB website on January 14, 2017.

On January 13, 2017 at approximately 6:00 pm, § 87(2)(b) went to the 6th Precinct Stationhouse to file a stolen property report regarding the alleged theft of her cell phone. While filling out the report, PO Vanessa McBride of the 6th Precinct allegedly told § 87(2)(b) “That sounds stupid,” when § 87(2)(b) explained what had happened to her (**Allegation A**). § 87(2)(b) had a further exchange with Sgt. John Kaloudis, also of the 6th Precinct, before she was told to leave the stationhouse and complied.

§ 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(g)

This case is being submitted for closure more than 90 days after it was assigned because § 87(2)(b) missed two scheduled interviews, and did not appear for an interview until more than 30 days after the complaint was filed.

No video footage of this incident was identified by the investigation.

Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) rejected mediation because she did not want to speak to the officers again.
- As of March 31, 2017, no Notice of Claim has been filed with the NYC Office of the Comptroller in regards to this incident.
- § 87(2)(b) has no criminal conviction history.

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b)
- In her fifteen year tenure at the NYPD, PO McBride was a subject in one previous complaint, 201608787, in which allegations of a threat of arrest, refusal to provide name and shield, and discourtesy were closed as complainant uncooperative. § 87(2)(g)

Potential Issues

- § 87(2)(b) stated she interacted with a civilian who was inside a plexiglass enclosure before speaking with PO McBride. Given that this individual was inside the complaint room during the incident, it is unlikely that they would have heard the exchange between § 87(2)(b) and PO McBride, and therefore they were not interviewed for this case.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A: Discourtesy – Police Officer Vanessa McBride spoke discourteously to

§ 87(2)(b)

In her February 16, 2017 interview at the CCRB (Board Review 02), § 87(2)(b) said that while filling out her stolen property report at a desk, she was approached by PO McBride. § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) explained to PO McBride that she had been assaulted by someone, that she was unsure if this person had been a police officer, and that the person took her phone from her purse. PO McBride said the story did not make sense and was a lie, and then went to speak with Sgt. Kaloudis. Sgt. Kaloudis shouted, “What happened?” to § 87(2)(b) across the desk, and she continued explaining to Sgt. Kaloudis and PO McBride. PO McBride allegedly said, “That sounds stupid.” § 87(2)(b) was told that no report could be filed if she did not know the IMEI number of the phone or the name of the person who took it. § 87(2)(b) was told to leave the stationhouse, which she did.

§ 87(2)(b)'s online complaint narrative was generally consistent with her interview statement, except that she did not specify which officer made the discourteous comment.

§ 87(2)(b) did not independently mention this allegation in her January 23, 2017 phone statement (Board Review 03).

PO McBride (Board Review 04) stated that she was working at the Telephone Switchboard Desk when § 87(2)(b) entered the stationhouse. After speaking with someone in the complaint room for five minutes, § 87(2)(b) walked towards PO McBride and Sgt. Kaloudis. § 87(2)(b) wanted something done in relation to a phone, and PO McBride told her that this thing could not be done, although PO McBride could not recall what she specifically said to § 87(2)(b). After five minutes, PO McBride spoke with Sgt. Kaloudis, because § 87(2)(b) was not satisfied with what PO McBride told her. Sgt. Kaloudis spoke to § 87(2)(b) from behind the desk, and PO McBride went back to her desk to answer the phone. PO McBride could not hear Sgt. Kaloudis and § 87(2)(b)'s conversation and did not see when § 87(2)(b) left the stationhouse. PO McBride never said to § 87(2)(b) that she was stupid or that her story sounded stupid.

Sgt. Kaloudis (Board Review 05) stated that he could see PO McBride speaking to § 87(2)(b) but only out of his peripheral vision, and he could not hear them. When PO McBride asked him for assistance, Sgt. Kaloudis approached § 87(2)(b) who told him she wanted a complaint report filed about a lost cellphone. Sgt. Kaloudis told § 87(2)(b) that documentation, including the phone's IMEI number, was needed to file the complaint. § 87(2)(b) was upset because she did not have the documentation. Sgt. Kaloudis told § 87(2)(b) to come back when she had the necessary documentation. PO McBride never said that § 87(2)(b) or her story was stupid.

§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)
§ 87(2)(g)

Squad: 3

Investigator: _____
Signature Print Date

Squad Leader: _____
Title/Signature Print Date

Reviewer:

Title/Signature

Print

Date